Merit Policy

Part I: University-Wide Processes Required by the CBA

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (hereafter, faculty members) who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the faculty members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises.

As shown in the table below (adapted from Article 17, Section 11.1.3), merit for FY 2018 is calculated during spring 2017 semester based on performance during the previous calendar year, and this merit rating is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases. Merit for FY 2019 is calculated during the fall 2017 semester based on performance during the AY 2016-17 (Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Summer 2017), and this merit rating is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for 12-month contracts).

Year Merit Raise is Added to Base Salary	**Merit Increase Pool**	**Period of Time Included in Merit Determination**	**When Merit Review and Recommendations are Made by Academic Unit, Chair/Director, and Dean**
FY 17 *(i.e., 2016-2017 Academic Year Contract)*	1.00%	CY 2015 *(i.e., Spring 2015, Summer 2015, Fall 2015)*	Spring semester of AY 2015-2016
FY 18 *(i.e., 2017-2018 Academic Year Contract)*	1.00%	CY 2016 *(i.e., Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2016)*, CY 2015 *(i.e., Spring 2015, Summer 2015, Fall 2015)*, and CY 2014 *(i.e., Spring 2014, Summer 2014, Fall 2014)*	Spring semester of AY 2016-2017
FY 19 *(i.e.,2018-2019 Academic Year Contract)*	1.00%	AY 2016-2017 *(i.e., Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Summer 2017)*, CY 2016 *(i.e., Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2016)*, and CY 2015 *(i.e., Spring 2015, Summer 2015, Fall 2015)*	Fall semester of AY 2017-2018

Merit eligibility will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive merit scores for each of the three performance areas as well as an overall merit score which will identify whether the faculty member's performance was unacceptable, does not meet expectations for merit, does meet expectations for merit, or exceeded expectations for merit.

Receiving an evaluation of "unacceptable" from unit faculty (not the Chair/Director) in any area of performance (teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, service) during the annual review process may initiate an Extraordinary Review (see Article 31 of the CBA). Failure to meet expectations for merit does not necessarily indicate "unacceptable" performance. An evaluation of "unacceptable" is presumed to occur infrequently as it indicates a pattern of performance that is below an ordinary and acceptable level and warrants attention. Definitions of "unacceptable" shall be determined by the unit faculty and Chair/Director with the approval of the Dean (Article 31, Section 3.1).

The three performance area merit scores as well as the overall merit score will include six or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the merit score must clearly identify whether performance is unacceptable, does not meet expectations for merit, does meet expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the six categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 0 = Unacceptable; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the Chair/Director may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria, performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores are contained in each unit's Merit Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes document."

> ***NOTE:*** *The Dean of each College will determine which of the exemplars for calculating merit scores found in Appendix A will be used by the academic units in that College. Each academic unit will them complete that exemplar as appropriate given the unit's discipline, mission, etc. The completed instrument will be included in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes."*

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

2.1. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year for merit decisions made for FY 2018, and prior to the beginning of the academic year for merit decisions made in FY 2019, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the Chair/Director.

2.2. The academic unit merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every faculty member. A description of the committee composition and the election/appointment process is outlined in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes."

2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "unacceptable" and will not be eligible for any salary adjustments (Article 17, Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.1). For NTTF in years one through six, a merit rating of "unacceptable" will be independent from the APR process.
2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include the elements outlined in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes document.
2.5. A description of how the overall merit score is calculated, including how annual scores are averaged over a three-year period, can be found in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes document, chosen from exemplars provided in Appendix A of this document.
2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth of a decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

3.1. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals – Merit Reviews Conducted during Spring Semester

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the Chair/Director.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the Chair/Director (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the Chair/Director (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the Chair/Director). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the Chair/Director. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the Chair/Director (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

3.2. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals – Merit Reviews Conducted during Fall Semester

Dates are under review and will be established by December 2016.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

4.1.1. **Faculty Exchange Leave** (Article 21, Section 2.1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2. **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section 3.1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3. **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section 4.5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.4. **Sick Leave** (). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.

4.1.5. **Parental Leave** (Article 21, Section 11.9). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Chair's/Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6. **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section 12.3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.7. **Faculty Improvement Leave** (Article 22, Section 7.3.4) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

4.2.1. **New Faculty Hires.** New faculty members whose employment does not include the full year of performance on which merit is typically based shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.2.2. The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the Chair/Director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend their unit's Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes document at any time. Amendments to the merit document must be approved by the Dean and Provost.

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Earth, Environment, and Society

Section A - Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: teaching, research, and service. To determine whether faculty members have "unacceptable" performance or failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., teaching, research, and service).

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the School faculty member on the following performance criteria: teaching, research, and service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit Committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the Merit Committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (teaching, research, and service). Merit Committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form that follows.

The Merit Committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section D. The overall merit score may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit score reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The School Director will also assign an overall merit rating using the same criteria and scoring system as used by the Merit Committee. The Director may elect to accept the Merit Committee scores for an individual faculty member if the Director scores are not significantly different from the Merit Committee scores. The Director will provide each faculty member with his/her scores and an explanation should the scores differ from that of the Merit Committee. The Committee's scores and the Director's scores, including an explanation of any differences, will then be submitted to the Dean, along with a recommendation as to the distribution of merit dollars (Section E).

The consequences of an "unacceptable" rating in any category during a single merit review period are outlined in the current CBA (2016-2019), and differ depending on the category of faculty. In the case on of a NTTF in year seven and beyond, such a rating is considered an "unsatisfactory annual evaluation" (Article 14). In the case of a tenured faculty member, such a rating is considered one of several possible "triggering events" for an extraordinary review (Article 31). In all cases, possible extenuating circumstances will be considered in guiding the course of action resulting from an unacceptable rating, following procedures outlined in the CBA.

Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

General Guidance for Performance Evaluations

Teaching

Primary evaluation based on:

- Quality of teaching, including student and peer evaluations (numerical and written)
- Graduate and undergraduate theses completed
- Teaching awards

Also considered:

- Developing and teaching new courses
- Making major revisions to a course or teaching a course for the first time
- Developing and implementing innovative/high impact teaching strategies
- Serving on graduate and undergraduate thesis committees
- Additional teaching contributions (e.g., independent studies, directed readings, directed research, teaching experience outside the classroom, field trips, laboratory instruction, leading workshops, brown bags, etc.)
- Professional development activities designed to improve teaching

Research

Primary evaluation based on:

- Peer-reviewed publications
- External funding received
- Research awards

Also considered:

- Presentations at professional meetings
- Submission of proposals for external funding
- Internal grants and contracts from the University, College, or School
- Professional development activities designed to improve research
- Dissemination of results of engaged scholarship
- Commercialization of research activities

Service

Primary evaluation based on:

- Serving on Departmental, School, College, and University committees
- Service to BGSU FA
- Professional service (including, but not limited to, serving on committees for professional societies, serving as a journal editor, and reviewing grant proposals and manuscripts)
- Serving on committees or advisory panels for federal, state and local government entities
- Service-related activities that take considerable time, but do not result in a course reduction
- Service awards

Also considered:

- Invited lectures at other universities or schools
- Outreach and recruitment activities
- Equipment or lab oversight/instruction
- Professional development activities designed to improve service

Teaching

Performance Indicator	Scoring Range (0 -2)	Scoring Range (3-5)	Scoring Range (6-7)	Committee Score (0-7)	Weight (sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	Weighted Rating (Comm. Score * Weight)
Quantitative Student Evaluations (using School evaluation form)	Average of courses below 3.0 out of 5	most between 3.0 to 4.0 out of 5, average of courses above 3.5	most above 4.0 out of 5, average of courses above 4.0		2	
Qualitative Student Evaluations (using School evaluation form)	less than 50% positive comments	50% - 74% positive comments	75% - 100% positive comments		1	
Peer Reviews (using School form)	either no peer review or Poor-Fair peer review	good peer review(s)	excellent peer review(s)		1	
Professional Development related to course development/pedagogy	none	one PD activity (or equivalent)	more than one PD activity (or equivalent)		0.5	
High Impact Practices/Innovative Practices/ Instructional Development (e.g., service learning, field trips/field experiences)	none	One HIP, IP or ID (or equivalent)	more than one HIP, IP or ID (or equivalent)		1	
Teaching other than formal classes (e.g., theses, dissertations, independent studies, honors projects, supervise internships, textbook)	none	1 -2 activities (or equivalent)	>2 activities (or equivalent)		1	
Teaching Recognition (e.g., teaching awards, thesis awards, master teacher nomination, etc.)	none	none	1 or more TRs		0.5	
					Total teaching score (Σ weighted rating/7)	

The total teaching score will be based on a range of accomplishments, as delineated in the table and the general guidance language above. Rating categories and their corresponding total scores are as follows: Exceeds expectations (>6); Meets expectations (≥2, ≤6); Does not meet expectations (≥1, <2); Unacceptable performance (< 1).

Research

Performance Indicator	Scoring Range (0-2)	Scoring Range (3-5)	Scoring Range (6-7)	Committee Score	Weight	Weighted Rating
Publications*						
Refereed journal article or book chapter published (6 pts. each)						
Refereed journal article or book chapter submitted (1 pt. each)						
Scholarly Book (10 pts. each)						
Editor of refereed symposium proceeding (3 pts. each)						
Abstract and presentation at professional meeting (national 1 pt. each; regional 0.5 pts. each)						
Non-refereed articles, reports, etc. (1 pt. each)						
Grants and Contracts*	<20 pts	20-40 pts	>40 pts		6	
External grant funded (2 pts + 0.0001 times funding amount per year each)						
Internal grant funded (1 pt. each)						
Submission of external grant (1 pt. each)						
Commercialization of products/patents (1 pt. each)						
*Total point values in the section are weighted to account for allocation of effort by dividing by the % allocation.						
Research Recognition						
Research Honors and Awards	none	none	1 or more		1	
High journal impact factor						
Large (>$25K/year) grants funded						
Invited Speaker at Research Conference						
*SUM of points in this section is divided by % effort for research (e.g., for 40% effort divide points by .40)					**Total Research Score (Σ weighted rating/7)**	

NOTE - The point values are based on the general expectations of:

Exceeds expectations = 2 or more peer-reviewed journal articles, external funding of at least $20,000, or equivalent combination of other activities.

Meets expectation = 1 peer-reviewed journal article and an external grant of any value, or equivalent combination of other activities.

Does not meet expectations = no peer-reviewed papers, no external funding, few other substantial research indicators.

Unacceptable performance = no peer-reviewed papers, no external funding, no other substantial research indicators.

Service

Performance Indicator	Score Range (0-2)	Score Range (3-5)	Score Range (6-7)	Committee Score	Weight	Weighted Rating
Service to Department/ School	Limited to no engagement (no advising or committee, limited attendance at faculty meetings)	Serves on 1 or 2 active committees, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)	Serves on 3 or more active committees, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)		2	
Service to College/ University	No participation on college/univ. committees or events	Serves on 1 committee, faculty senator, volunteer involvement at College/University level (or equivalent)	Serves on 2 or more committees, heavy volunteer involvement at College/University level		2	
Service to Profession	None	Serves on 1 committee, volunteer services (or equivalent)	Serves on 2 or more committees, heavy volunteer (or equivalent)		1	
Service to Community	Limited (1 brief activity) or no participation	1 or 2 significant community service/recruitment activities, 1 of which is extensive/ongoing	3 or more significant community service/recruitment activities, 2 of which are extensive/ongoing		1	
Service Recognition	None	1 example of service award, leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)	2 or more examples of service award leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)		1	
					Total Service Score (Σ weighted rating/7)	

The total service score will be based on a range of accomplishments, as delineated in the table and the general guidance language above. Rating categories and their corresponding total scores are as follows: Exceeds expectations (>6); Meets expectations (≥2, ≤6); Does not meet expectations (≥1, <2); Unacceptable performance (< 1).

NOTES

Service Activities for Department/School may include, but are not limited to:

Undergraduate Advisor
Internship Coordinator
Undergraduate Paleobiology Advisor
Field Camp Director
Department or School Committee
Faculty Search Committee
Department/School equipment/laboratory maintenance
Student Organization Advising

Service Activities for College/University may include:

Faculty Senate
College or University Committee
Faculty/Student Mentoring at College/University level
Service to BGSU FA

Service Activities for Profession may include:

Associate Editor of Professional Journal
Committee Member
Organizer for Session at Professional Meeting
Reviewer for Professional Journal/Grant Proposals

Outreach Activities may include:

Community Service related to BGSU Faculty Appointment
Committees or advisory panels for federal, state and local government entities
Recruitment Activities

Service Recognition Activities may include:

Journal Editor
Service Honors and Awards
Officeholder of Professional Society
Officeholder Faculty Senate
Chairing/Leadership on Committees
Exceptional Service Activity

Section B - Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The School Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every Bargaining Unit Faculty Member. The committee is composed of four members, one elected from each department and one school appointee. To the extent possible, the committee should have representation from each faculty category (NTTF, undergraduate, graduate).

Section C - Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit report will include a copy of the College Annual Faculty Record Update form or similar instrument recommended by the Merit Committee. Should the faculty member feel that the update form or other instrument does not sufficiently describe or include activities that s/he feels are meritorious, s/he may include a brief (one-page maximum) description of those activities for consideration by the Merit Committee. Student course evaluations (both written comments and numerical scores) will be used as a part of the teaching quality evaluation, and will be available electronically to faculty. Each faculty member is responsible for submitting accurate and complete documents by the deadline. No changes to those documents will be accepted after the deadline. However, the Director or the Merit Committee members may request further explanation of certain activities after submission.

Section D - Calculation of Overall Merit Score

Each committee member will evaluate the merit report, guided by the criteria described in Section D. Evaluations will be done in light of the negotiated workload allocations described in Section E. Members of the Merit Committee will not evaluate themselves.

Once the Merit Committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance area (teaching, research, and service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area (Section E):

[Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

Both in individual performance areas in which a faculty member is assigned allocation of effort and in overall merit score, the assignment of does not meet, meets, and exceeds expectations from the merit scores is as follows:

Merit Score	Interpretation
<2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; recommendation for no merit
2-6	Meets basic expectations for merit; eligible for merit
>6	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit

Scores indicating "unacceptable" performance are defined differently for each assigned performance area as follows:

Merit Score	Interpretation
Teaching Score <1 Research Score =0 Service Score <1	Unacceptable performance

The School recommends that the merit dollars be allocated to the faculty who met or exceeded performance expectations in proportion to their three-year average overall score above the meets expectation merit line (2.0).

The three-year average will be calculated by averaging the current overall merit score with the overall merit scores of the previous two years.

Section E - Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Nominal Allocations of Effort for School Faculty According to Role in School

1. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty
   Teaching – 90%
   Research – 0%
   Service – 10%
2. Tenured or tenure-track faculty whose primary responsibility is undergraduate education
   Teaching – 65%
   Research – 25%
   Service – 10%
3. Tenured or tenure-track faculty whose responsibility includes undergraduate education and graduate education (supervision of MS theses and graduate teaching)
   Teaching – 50%
   Research – 40%
   Service – 10%

Approved by the School of Earth, Environment, and Society by electronic vote of the Faculty concluding April 17, 2017.

Name, Chair/Director Date 4/20/17

Approved: Name, Dean of College Name Date 4/20/17

Approved: Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP Date 5/3/17